



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,163	11/21/2003	Randy J. Longsdorf	R11.12-0812	2356
27367	7590	02/19/2009		
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.			EXAMINER	
SUITE 1400			NORTON, JENNIFER L	
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			2121	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/19/2009	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/719,163 <b>Examiner</b> Jennifer L. Norton	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LONGSDORF ET AL. <b>Art Unit</b> 2121
<i>–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –</i>		
<b>THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</b>		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<b>NOTICE OF APPEAL</b>		
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>		
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
<b>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</b>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
<b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</b>		
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:</p> <p><u>See Continuation Sheet</u></p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s)</i>. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		
<p>/Albert DeCady/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2121</p>		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pg. 2, filed on 05 February 2009 with respect to the rejection of claims 1-53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to Applicant's argument that prior art does not teach, "retrofit monitoring device" (see Remarks pg. 2, paragraph 3) and "feature module which couples to a sensor module to retrofit a transmitter" (see Remarks pg. 2, paragraph 5), the Examiner recognizes the Applicant has not accounted for the combination of Eryurek, Flaemig and Sederlund under 35 U.S.C 103(a) for these limitations as set forth in the Final Office Action, mailed on 09 December 2008.

In summary the combination of the component monitor (i.e. inference engine incorporated in the process device) of Eryurek in view of the retrofit monitoring device (i.e. add-on monitoring device (Fig. 1, element 12) of Flaemig in further view of the safety Integrity Level (SIL) of Sederlund teaches "retrofit monitoring device" and "feature module which couples to a sensor module to retrofit a transmitter" as claimed in the instant application.

Furthermore, Applicant has argued "Element 12 shown in Figure 1 of Eryurek (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,143) is identified as providing a "retrofit monitoring device"" (see Remarks pg. 2, paragraph 3). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Element 12 of Figure 1 of Flaemig (U.S. Patent No. 7,054,765) was indicated as teaching to a retrofitted component monitor (e.g. see Final Office Action mailed on 09 December 2008, pgs. 2-5, paragraph 4).

Hence, Claims 1-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed on 09 December 2008.